



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/893,335

06/26/2001

Jin-Lin Chen

MS1-913US

1132

22801

7590

09/15/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC

421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500

SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	Application No. 09/893,335	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Laurie Ries	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 and 25-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 and 25-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/5/06, 9/14/05, 3/30/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 10 July 2006, to the Original Application, filed 26 June 2001.
2. Claims 16-23 and 25-58 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Patent 5,537,526) in view of Bergman (U.S. Patent 6,564,263 B1) and Makipaa (U.S. Patent 6,556,217 B1).
3. Claims 16-23 and 25-58 are pending. Claims 16, 26, 29, 31, 43, 45, and 54 are independent claims.

Examiner's Note

4. A second set of rejections has been added for claims 31-42 and 45-53.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 16-23, 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per independent claims 16, 26, and 29, lines 10-11 of claim 16, lines 9-10 of claim 26, and lines 11-12 of claim 29 contain two separate functions both labeled as number (1). Appropriate correction is required.

Dependent claims 17-23, 25, 27-28, and 30 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of the base claim(s) from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims ^{16-23, 25-58} ~~1-58~~ (web) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (USPN 5,537,526 - issued on 7/1996) in view of Bergman (USPN 6,564,263 B1 - filed 12/1999), and further in view of Makipaa et al. (USPN 6,556,217 B1 - filed 06/2000).

Regarding independent claim 29 and (claims 16-17, 18-22, 25-26, 31-40, 43-54, and 56-58), Anderson discloses: One or more computer-readable media having

computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to:

analyze one or more functions associated with a page that is configured for presentation on a first device type (Anderson on col. 14, line 26 - col. 15, line 30 teaches one or more commands associated with the document) by generating one or more function-based object models that represent objects (Anderson on col. 13, lines 16-42 teaches Model Command Objects operating with the command objects to change model) comprising the page, said objects comprising:

one or more basic objects associated with the page, objects comprising a smallest information body that cannot be further divided, said one or more objects (Anderson see Abstract and col. 1, line 59- col. 2, line 5 teaches object oriented framework of a compound document to support changes using command objects) being configured to perform one or more of the following functions:

(1) providing semantic information, (1) navigating to other objects, (3) providing a visual effect on the webpage, and (4) enabling user interaction (Anderson on col. 11, lines 13-24 teaches providing data presentation to be viewed and/or modified by the user and on col. 1, line 59 - col. 2, line 5 teaches framework of the document provide support of document changes);

said generating of the one or more function-based object models comprising generating at least one function-based object model for a object (Anderson on col. 13, lines 16-42 teaches Model Command Objects for command objects that operates on the model to change the model), said at least one function-based object model being

generated as a function of one or more of the following properties: (1) a presentation property that defines a way in which the object is presented, (3) a decoration property pertaining to an extent to which the basic objects serves to decorate the page, (4) a hyperlink property pertaining to an object to which the basic object points via a hyperlink, and (5) a interaction property pertaining to an interaction method-of the basic object (Anderson on col. 4, lines 51-61 teaches the user can provide links within the document framework and on col. 14, line 26 - col. 15, line 39 teaches commands used to manipulate the display of a compound document).

However, Anderson does not explicitly disclose "basic object" and "clustering relationship property pertaining to a relationship among root children of the composite object, presentation relationship property pertaining to a presentation order associated with the root children of the composite object" and "composite objects comprising objects that contain other objects, said one or more composite objects having a clustering function".

Anderson also does not teach expressly applying one or more rules to the function-based object models.

Bergman on col. 21, lines 48-60 teaches simple and composite objects; on col, 3, lines 36-51 and col. 17, lines 29-40 teaches relationships between presentation objects; and on col. 6, lines 62-64 teaches specification of semantics and syntax for combining media objects into composite objects.

Bergman also teaches applying rules to the object model (See Bergman, Column 10, lines 11-44).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bergman into Anderson to provide simple and composite objects and define presentation relationship of an object, as taught by Bergman, incorporated into the object oriented framework of Anderson, in order to provide a unified framework.

It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the application of rules to the object model of Bergman with the content adaptation method of Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to derive a new entity using transformations that are defined by the rules.

However, Anderson and Bergman do not explicitly disclose "adapt the webpage for presentation on a second device type that is different from the first device type".

Makipaa discloses adapting page to be displayed based on the device capabilities (col. 3, lines 14-46).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Makipaa incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 9, 13, and 27, Makipaa discloses "adapting in view of one or more networking conditions" teaches adapting page to be displayed based on the device capabilities and network volume (col. 2, lines 1-23).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Makipaa incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 14, and 28, Makipaa discloses "adapting comprises doing so in view of one or more user preferences", on col. 5, line 65 teaches user profile.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Makipaa incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 10 and 24, Makipaa discloses "adapting comprises applying one or more rules", on col. 3, lines 14-28 teaches layout rules.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Makipaa incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 23 and 41, Makipaa discloses "using rule-based decision tree" on col. 3, lines 14-28 teaches rules are defined in a layout structure.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Makipaa incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 30 and 55, Makipaa discloses "adapt the webpage for presentation on a WAP-enabled device", on col. 2, lines 1-23 teaches WAP device.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Makipaa into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Makipaa, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claim 42, Bergman discloses "assigning a category from a set of object categories", on col. 8, lines 10-19 teaches categories of data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bergman into Anderson to provide simple and composite objects and define presentation relationship of an object, as taught by Bergman, incorporated into the object oriented framework of Anderson, in order to provide a unified framework.

7. Claims 31-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota (U.S. Publication 2005/0108637 A1).

As per independent claim 31, Sahota discloses a web content adaptation method including receiving multiple web pages configured for display (See Sahota, Figure 7, element 702).

Sahota also discloses processing the multiple web pages to provide multiple different objects associated with the webpages, individual objects having one or more properties relating to functions of the individual object (See Sahota, Page 4, paragraphs 0051-0052, and Page 5, paragraphs 0055 and 0059).

Sahota also discloses applying one or more rules to the objects sufficient to provide multiple different webpages that are configured for display on a second device type that is different from the first device type (See Sahota, Figure 2A, element 207A, and Page 5, paragraph 0057).

Sahota does not disclose expressly that the multiple web pages are configured for display on a first device type, however, Sahota does disclose configuring the web pages to be displayed by a browser, and it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that a web browser runs on a personal computer device. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the multiple web pages of Sahota to be displayed on a first device type, such as a personal computer running a web browser. The motivation for doing so would have been to create a template of web pages including HTML tags and attributes in order to display

text and images for a personal computer display (See Sahota, Page 3, paragraph 0038).

As per dependent claim 32, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have a presentation property that defines a way in which the object is presented (See Sahota, Page 5, paragraph 0060).

As per dependent claim 33, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have a semanteme property associated with the content of an object (See Sahota, Page 5, paragraph 0060).

As per dependent claim 34, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have a decoration property pertaining to the extent to which an object serves to decorate a webpage (See Sahota, Figure 8J, "image").

As per dependent claim 35, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have a hyperlink property pertaining to an object to which another object points via a hyperlink (See Sahota, Figure 8F, "href").

As per dependent claim 36, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have an interaction property pertaining to an interaction method of an object (See Sahota, Figure 8F, "href").

As per dependent claim 37, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have a clustering relationship property pertaining to a relationship among any root children of an object (See Sahota, Figure 7, element 710, and Page 9, paragraph 0098).

As per dependent claim 38, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the individual objects can have a presentation relationship property pertaining to a presentation order associated with any root children of an object (See Sahota, Figure 8O).

As per dependent claim 39, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the processing includes defining a representation of an object that includes any children of the object (See Sahota, Figure 8F).

As per dependent claim 40, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Sahota also discloses that the processing includes assigning a category to one or more objects (See Sahota, Page 9, paragraph 0097, and Figure 8E).

As per dependent claim 41, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 40 as described above. Sahota also discloses using a rule-based decision tree to ascertain a category for the one or more objects (See Sahota, Figure 8F).

As per dependent claim 42, Sahota discloses the limitations of claim 40 as described above. Sahota also discloses assigning a category including a navigation object that provides a navigation function (See Sahota, Figure 8F, "href").

8. Claims 45-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota (U.S. Publication 2005/0108637 A1) in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent 5,537,526).

As per independent claim 45, Sahota discloses a system for adapting web content from one format to another including one or more object models, individual object models representing objects that are present in a webpage in terms of one or more of an object's functional properties (See Sahota, Page 4, paragraphs 0051-0052, and Page 5, paragraphs 0055 and 0059).

Sahota does not disclose expressly one or more object models that are function-based. Anderson discloses Model Command Objects for command objects that operate on the model to change the model (See Anderson on col. 13, lines 16-42).

Sahota and Anderson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of delivering electronic content to a user.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the function-based object model of Anderson with the web content adaptation system of Sahota. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to incrementally modify a model, thus making it easier to undo or redo commands. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Anderson with Sahota for the benefit of to allowing a user to incrementally modify a model, thus making it easier to undo or redo commands, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 45.

As per dependent claim 46, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes

a presentation property that defines a way in which the object is presented (See Sahota, Page 5, paragraph 0060).

As per dependent claim 47, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes a semanteme property associated with the content of an object (See Sahota, Page 5, paragraph 0060).

As per dependent claim 48, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes a decoration property pertaining to the extent to which an object serves to decorate a webpage (See Sahota, Figure 8J, "image").

As per dependent claim 49, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes a hyperlink property pertaining to an object to which another object points via a hyperlink (See Sahota, Figure 8F, "href").

As per dependent claim 50, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes an interaction property pertaining to an interaction method of an object (See Sahota, Figure 8F, "href").

As per dependent claim 51, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes a clustering relationship property pertaining to a relationship among any root children of an object (See Sahota, Figure 7, element 710, and Page 9, paragraph 0098).

As per dependent claim 52, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses that one of the properties includes a presentation relationship property pertaining to a presentation order associated with any root children of an object (See Sahota, Figure 80).

As per dependent claim 53, Sahota and Anderson disclose the limitations of claim 45 as described above. Sahota also discloses software code embodied on a computer-readable storage medium that implements the system of claim 45 (See Sahota, Page 4, paragraph 0048).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 10 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on Page 17 of the Instant Amendment that Anderson in combination with Bergman and Makipaa fails to teach analyzing one or more functions associated with a webpage. The Office respectfully disagrees. Anderson teaches several functions, such as a TSelectCommand function, a TCutCommand function, and a TCopyCommand function, among others, associated with a page of a document (See Anderson, Column 14, line 15, through Column 15, line 30). Makipaa further teaches adapting content from web pages for various devices (See Makipaa, Column 2, line 59 through Column 3, line 11). Anderson and Makipaa are analogous art because they are

from the same field of endeavor of formatting electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the web pages of Makipaa with the formatting functions of Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to format the web page such that it was able to be displayed on a different device with a smaller display area in such a fashion that no or little information is lost or sacrificed (See Makipaa, Column 3, lines 5-11).

In response to applicant's argument that the Office has failed to present a sufficient motivation as to why it would have been obvious to combine Bergman with Anderson, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). The Office maintains that it would have been obvious to combine the simple and composite objects and the relationship between the objects of Bergman with the object oriented framework of Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a unified framework, which describes the multiple modalities/multiple fidelities nature of many multimedia objects, including metadata description of the spatial and temporal behavior of the object through space and/or time.

Applicant argues on Page 22 Instant Amendment that Anderson in combination with Bergman and Makipaa fails to teach receiving multiple web pages, processing the multiple web pages, or applying one or more rules to the objects sufficient to provide multiple different web pages. The Office respectfully disagrees. Makipaa teaches

Art Unit: 2176

receiving and processing multiple web pages (See Makipaa, figure 3). Anderson teaches generating one or more function-based object models that represent objects (See Anderson, Column 13, lines 16-42). Makipaa also teaches extracting and applying layout rules on elements, or objects, within a web page (See Makipaa, Figure 5, element 370, and Column 9, line 64 through Column 10, line 12). Anderson and Makipaa are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of formatting electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the layout rules of Makipaa with the function-based object model of Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to alter the elements, or objects, such that they are able to be displayed on a device with a smaller display area without losing data and while maintaining readability.

Applicant argues on Page 23 Instant Amendment that Anderson in combination with Bergman and Makipaa fails to teach a web content adaptation method that adapts web content from one format to another, and which uses multiple function-based object models to do so. The Office respectfully disagrees. Anderson teaches several functions, such as a TselectCommand function, a TcutCommand function, and a TcopyCommand function, among others, associated with a page of a document (See Anderson, Column 14, line 15, through Column 15, line 30). Makipaa further teaches adapting content from web pages for various devices (See Makipaa, Column 2, line 59 through Column 3, line 11). Anderson and Makipaa are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of formatting electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the web

pages of Makipaa with the formatting functions of Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to format the web page such that it was able to be displayed on a different device with a smaller display area in such a fashion that no or little information is lost or sacrificed (See Makipaa, Column 3, lines 5-11).

Applicant argues on Page 23 Instant Amendment that Anderson in combination with Bergman and Makipaa fails to teach a system for adapting web content from one format to another comprising one or more function-based object models. The Office respectfully disagrees. Anderson teaches several functions, such as a TselectCommand function, a TcutCommand function, and a TcopyCommand function, among others, associated with a page of a document (See Anderson, Column 14, line 15, through Column 15, line 30). Makipaa further teaches adapting content from web pages for various devices (See Makipaa, Column 2, line 59 through Column 3, line 11). Anderson and Makipaa are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of formatting electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the web pages of Makipaa with the formatting functions of Anderson. The motivation for doing so would have been to format the web page such that it was able to be displayed on a different device with a smaller display area in such a fashion that no or little information is lost or sacrificed (See Makipaa, Column 3, lines 5-11).

Applicant argues on Page 24 Instant Amendment that Anderson in combination with Bergman and Makipaa fails to teach an analysis module, one or more rules modules, or a content adaptation module. The Office respectfully disagrees. Anderson

teaches receiving and processing content of a page to produce one or more function-based object models, adapting the content based on one or more rules, processing the function-based object models in accordance with the rules, as discussed above.

Anderson also teaches a modular framework, including a data representation module, data specification module, model processing module, data presentation module, and data modification module, among others (See Anderson, Figure 21, and Column 18, line 58 through Column 19, line 15).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER